



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office,  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/995,130	11/27/2001	David B. MacLean	PC11088ATMC	9834

7590

12/17/2003

Gregg C. Benson  
Pfizer Inc.  
Patent Department, MS 4159, Eastern Point Road  
Groton, CT 06340

EXAMINER
----------

BAHAR, MOJDEH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/995,130

Applicant(s)

MACLEAN, DAVID B.

Examiner

Mojdeh Bahar

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-60 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's response to the first office action of June 18, 2003, submitted September 18, 2003 is acknowledged.

This application contains claims 6-60 drawn to an invention nonelected without traverse in Paper No. 7. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claims 1-5 are herein examined on the merits.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacLean et al. (USPN 5,889,042) and Lund et al. (*Testosterone and andropause*, Pharmacotherapy 19 (8): 951-6, August 1999).

MacLean et al. (USPN 5,889,042) teaches a method of treating testosterone insufficiency employing (-)-Cis-6-phenyl-5-[4-(2-pyrrolidin-1-yl-ethoxy)-phenyl]-5,6,7,8-tetrahydronaphthalen-2-ol, the elected specie herein.

Lund et al. teaches that elderly men suffering from andropause with low levels of testosterone benefited from a testosterone replacement therapy, see abstract and page 953 in particular. Lund et al. further teaches that steadily declining circulating testosterone levels in men suffering of andropause are implicated as a potential cause of symptoms and that restoring testosterone to physiological levels ameliorates symptoms associated with andropause.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ both (-)-Cis-6-phenyl-5-[4-(2-pyrrolidin-1-yl-ethoxy)-phenyl]-5,6,7,8-tetrahydronaphthalen-2-ol, and testosterone in a method of treating andropause.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ both (-)-Cis-6-phenyl-5-[4-(2-pyrrolidin-1-yl-ethoxy)-phenyl]-5,6,7,8-tetrahydronaphthalen-2-ol, and testosterone in a method of treating andropause because employing two agents that are individually known to be useful in treating andropause in a method of treating the same is prima facie obvious. The Skilled Artisan would reasonably expect to obtain an additive effect by combining the two agents.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed September 18, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant first argues that MacLean does not teach the treatment of male andropause. Note that as stated in the obviousness rejection herein above MacLean teaches a method of treating testosterone insufficiency employing (-)-Cis-6-phenyl-5-[4-(2-pyrrolidin-1-yl-

ethoxy)-phenyl]-5,6,7,8-tetrahydronaphthalen-2-ol, the elected specie herein. Note that andropause is known to be associated with low testosterone levels as taught by the Lund reference, see abstract for example. Treating testosterone insufficiency is useful in treating a condition known to be associated with a decline in testosterone levels.

Applicant further argues that there is no suggestion to combine testosterone with (-)-Cis-6-phenyl-5-[4-(2-pyrrolidin-1-yl-ethoxy)-phenyl]-5,6,7,8-tetrahydronaphthalen-2-ol, the elected specie herein in a method of treating andropause. Note that given that both testosterone and the elected specie herein are individually known to treat andropause combining them in a composition useful in treating andropause is obvious. Applicant then refers to col. 13, lines 19-22, note that this portion of the prior art is silent about employment/addition of testosterone in a method of treating andropause.

Applicant then states that Lund et al. discusses the use of testosterone alone in a method of treating andropause. Applicant relies on two sentences on page 995, stating that the use of testosterone for andropause is speculative. Note that the reference teaches the employment of testosterone for treating andropause. Even in the portion quoted by the applicant, the reference in relevant part provides: "further clinical evaluation of TRT in men with low testosterone levels and symptoms of andropause is warranted." Therefore Lund does indeed suggest the employment of testosterone in a method of treating andropause. Applicant then refers to first full paragraph of page 952, that is concerned with Testosterone secretion. Support for applicant's conclusory statement that "thus the administration of exogenous testosterone can negatively impact the production of endogenous testosterone" is not found in the cited passage. It is not clear how applicant has arrived at such conclusion.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mojdeh Bahar whose telephone number is (703) 305-1007. The examiner can normally be reached on (703) 305-1007 from 8:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on (703) 305-1877. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Art Unit: 1617

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Mojdeh Bahar  
Patent Examiner  
December 2, 2003



**SREENI PADMANABHAN**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

12/15/03